



2877  
*[Handwritten signature]*

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Gary R. Janik et al.

Assignee: KLA-Tencor, Inc.

Title: LASER-BASED CLEANING DEVICE FOR FILM  
ANALYSIS TOOL

Serial No.: 10/056,271

File Date: January 23, 2002

Examiner: Gordon J. Stock, JR Art Unit: 2877

Docket No.: KLA-003

-----  
Date: December 2, 2004

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

Dear Sir:

On November 4, 2004, the undersigned spoke with Examiner Gordon J. Stock, JR concerning the Response to the Office Action filed by the undersigned in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on August 23, 2004.

The undersigned explained in greater detail some of the issues raised in the above-mentioned Response, and in particular, addressed the following points:

1. Claims 1, 7, 8, 24, 27, 28, 32, 33, 41, 42, and 47 were rejected in the first Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Abercrombie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,666,063). The undersigned pointed out that Abercrombie only teaches device-level testing, and does not teach or suggest "measuring the thin film", and therefore does not anticipate Claims 1, 7, 8, 24, 27, 28, 32, 33, 41, 42, and 47.

2. Claims 1, 8, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 24, 27, 28, 33, 36, 37, 41, 44, 47, and 50 were rejected in the first Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Elliott et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,669,979). The undersigned pointed out that Elliott only teaches contaminant layer detection, and does not teach or suggest "measuring the thin film", and therefore does not anticipate Claims 1, 8, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 24, 27, 28, 33, 36, 37, 41, 44, 47, and 50.

Examiner Stock noted that while further consideration and research would be necessary, he was inclined to concur on point 1, but did not necessarily agree on point 2. Examiner Stock indicated that the contaminant layer measurement of Elliott might be considered to be a surface cleanliness measurement of the underlying thin film. Examiner Stock further indicated that under such an interpretation of Elliott, the rejections might be overcome by incorporating claim limitations directed towards particular thin film measurements other than surface cleanliness (e.g., thickness, composition).

The undersigned thanks Examiner Stock for his time in granting the interview and for his helpful guidance in the prosecution of the instant application. Please direct any comments or questions to the undersigned at (408) 451-5903.

Respectfully submitted,



Customer No.: 32357

John M. Kubodera  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 45984

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on December 2, 2004.

12/2/2004  
Date

Rebecca A. Baumann  
Signature: Rebecca A. Baumann